



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,063	02/06/2002	Siebert Wessels	1690	6396

7590

07/08/2003

Striker Striker & Stenby
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, NY 11743

EXAMINER

LE, DANG D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/889,063	WESSELS, SIEGBERT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dang D Le	2834	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>0701</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: . |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figures 1-4 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2, 6, 11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 2, it is not clear what "it" refers to in line 2. It is neither clear what "a non-rotationally symmetrical rotor body" means.

Regarding claim 6, it is not clear what "its" refers to in line 3.

Regarding claim 11, it is not clear what "its" refers to in line 2.

Regarding claim 16, it is not clear what "a turned part" is.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-6, 11-13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kajiura et al.

Regarding claim 1, Kajiura et al. show a rotor body (Figure 1), in particular for the rotor of the starter or the starter-generator of an internal combustion engine, with a hub (1231) extending coaxial to the rotational axis of the rotor, characterized in that the rotor body is comprised of a rotationally symmetrical base body (1200), which constitutes the hub (1231), and one or more lamellas (1210, 1220), which each have a continuously uniform thickness in the direction of the rotational axis of the rotor.

Regarding claims 2-6, 11-13, 15, and 16, it is noted that Kajiura et al. also show all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajiura et al. in view of Kaneyuki.

Regarding claim 7, Kajiura et al. show all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for one or more lamellas constituting at least one connecting region, which is provided for connecting the rotor body to at least one clutch element.

Kaneyuki shows one or more lamellas constituting at least one connecting region, which is provided for connecting the rotor body to at least one clutch element for the purpose of making a start/alternator.

Since Kajiura et al. and Kaneyuki are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add a clutch as taught by Kaneyuki for the purpose discussed above.

Regarding claim 8, it is noted that Kaneyuki also shows all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

8. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajiura et al. in view of Ruhl.

Regarding claim 9, Kajiura et al. show all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for means provided for fastening a reinforcing ring, which covers at least parts of the rotor winding.

Ruhl shows means provided for fastening a reinforcing ring, which covers at least parts of the rotor winding for the purpose of supporting the rotor end winding.

Since Kajiura et al. and Ruhl are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add a reinforcing ring as taught by Ruhl for the purpose discussed above.

Regarding claim 10, it is noted that Ruhl also shows all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajiura et al. in view of Hashimoto et al.

Regarding claim 14, Kajiura et al. show all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the inner geometry of at least one essentially annular lamella constituting teeth that serve as a pulse generator.

Hashimoto et al. show the inner geometry of at least one essentially annular lamella constituting teeth that serve as a pulse generator for the purpose of monitoring the rotor position.

Since Kajiura et al. and Hashimoto et al. are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to add teeth that serve as a pulse generator as taught by Hashimoto et al. for the purpose discussed above.

Information on How to Contact USPTO

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dang D Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-0156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

July 3, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dang D Le', with a stylized flourish at the end.

DANG LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER